

### REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-9, 12-16, 28-49, 53-59, 62-65, and 68-71 were presented for examination and were pending in this application. The Examiner issued another restriction requirement for Groups I, II, and III and provisionally elected group II.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the interview of May 3, 2006. Applicants elect Group I with traverse (claims 1, 3-8, 54-57, 72 and 73).

Applicants also add new claims 74-77, which depend from claim 1 and cover actions that are taken by a decider system. These claims should not require new search since they are formed from pending claim 73. These claims address the situation where a common party has two pending requests and the common party and other parties to the requests all become available. The decider must decide which of the pending requests to activate.

Applicants also add new claims 78-81.

Applicants have also made a clarifying amendment to claims 1 and 73.

#### The rejections over Vardi

Applicants' invention, as recited in claim 1, recites:

1. A computer-implemented method for the intermediation of real time meetings, comprising:

receiving an indication by a requester system that a requester (R-A) wants to request a realtime meeting M-A with a target T-A;

sending to a decider system (D) a request to conduct a real time meeting M-A;

queuing the request for the meeting M-A by the decider system;

receiving by the decider system (D) an availability status of T-A;

receiving by the decider system (D) an availability status of R-A

receiving an indication by the requester system that a requester (R-B) wants to request a realtime meeting M-B with target T-B, the meeting M-B to be disjoint in time with the meeting M-A; and such that one of the parties to M-A (R-A or T-A), known as the 'common party' is also the same as one of the parties to M-B (R-B or T-B) and thus there are only three distinct parties, the decider D being associated with the common party;

sending to the decider system (D) a request to conduct a real time meeting M-B;

queuing the request for the meeting M-B by the decider system, such that at least two distinct meetings, disjoint in time are placed in the queue;

receiving by the decider system (D) an availability status of target T-B;

receiving by the decider system (D) an availability status of the requester R-B;

initiating, by the decider system, one of the two meetings M-A and M-B by connecting the common party and the other party to that meeting when the common party and that other party are mutually available; and

dequeuing the request for a meeting upon its completion.

Thus, in applicants' invention, a common party has multiple pending real time meetings (M-A and M-B) at the same time and both are queued.

In contrast, Vardi fails to disclose or suggest that there are multiple pending real time meetings for a common party are in a queue at the same time. Vardi discloses tracking a single target user at multiple phone lines belonging to the target user, and it discloses tracking a group of target users all intended to join the same conference call, but it does not disclose or suggest any mechanism through which a requesting user might

simultaneously seek disjoint calls with two or more different target users (or vice versa).

In the conference session discussion in column 7, Vardi fails to disclose a target party to a conference call being sought for more than one conference call. Vardi has no system for two calls becoming possible at once. This is described in more detail in new claims 74-81. For example, in applicants' invention, if all parties become available at once, only one of the meetings will occur immediately and the other meeting will stay queued (see new claim 81).

Vardi also fails to disclose how a decider system might decide between two meetings if all participants become available (see claim 73 and new claims 74-77).

Vardi also fails to discuss how a target user might deal with being sought by, or receiving call-back notifications from two or more requesting users (see new claim 78).

Vardi also does not disclose or suggest a requesting user also being sought by a different, third requesting user (see new claim 79). Vardi also fails to disclose or suggest a system where each of three users has requested and has pending requests for two or more calls (see new claim 80).

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited art. Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of these claims.

In addition, Applicants respectfully invites the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if the Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,  
BRADLEY S. TEMPLETON

Date: May 4, 2006

By:  \_\_\_\_\_

Laura A. Majerus, Reg. No. 33,417  
FENWICK & WEST LLP  
Silicon Valley Center  
801 California Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041  
Phone: (650) 335-7152  
Fax: (650) 938-5200